

REMARKS

Upon entry of the above amendment, claims 1, 3-5, and 7-9 will have been amended for clarity without narrowing the scope of the claims. Further, no claims will have been added or canceled. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections together with an indication of the allowability of all of the claims in the present application, in due course.

Initially, Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging Applicants' claim for foreign priority and confirming receipt of the certified copy of the priority document.

In the Official Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings and asserted that Figure 4 should be designated by a legend, such as "Prior Art". Accordingly, as Figure 4 has been amended to include a "Prior Art" legend, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to the drawings.

The Examiner also objected to claims 1, 5, and 8 for minor informalities. In particular, the Examiner asserted that "operation speed should be "the low speed operation mode" in line 3 of claim 1. The Examiner also asserted that "operations", as recited in claims 5 and 8, should be "the low speed operation mode". The Examiner further asserts that "the second time period" should be "a second time period" in claims 8 and 15 and that "the stop operation mode" should be "a stop operation mode" in claim 8. To overcome the Examiner's objections, Applicants have amended the claims, as suggested by the Examiner, to enhance

the clarity thereof. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the claim objections and favorable reconsideration thereof.

Further, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over BUI (U.S. Patent No. 6,763,478) in view of ARAI (U.S. Patent No. 5,978,922). The Examiner rejected claims 5 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over BUI in view of ARAI and in further view of KLEIN (U.S. Patent No. 6,178,523). Further, the Examiner rejected claims 4, 7, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over BUI in view of KOHN (The IEEE Standard Dictionary of Electrical and Electronic Terms, 6th ed.) and ARAI (U.S. Patent No. 5,978,922).

Applicants, however, respectfully traverse each of the above mentioned rejections and submit that they are inappropriate with respect to the claims pending in the present application.

In this regard, Applicants submit that the invention, as recited in the claims, relates to a method for controlling a microcomputer which includes, inter alia, determining whether power is recovered or restored within a given time period and switching to a high speed operation mode when the power is determined to be recovered, as recited in claim 1.

In setting forth the rejection, the Examiner admits that BUI fails to disclose determining whether power is recovered within a given period and switching to a high speed operation mode when the power is determined to be recovered. Thus, the Examiner relies upon ARAI to supply the deficiencies of BUI and asserts that it would be obvious to combine the disclosure of BUI's variable clock

speed system with the teachings of ARAI's speed control and power resumption for expedient recovery of the last operating conditions of the system.

However, Applicants submit that the combination of BUI and ARAI, as proposed by the Examiner, is inappropriate at least due to a lack of motivation for the asserted combination. In this regard, Applicants submit that BUI is directed towards providing different clock frequencies depending on whether AC power or battery power is used in operating the system. That is, BUI is directed towards extending the life of the battery. In other words, BUI does not appear to be directed towards power shutdown, but is directed towards operating with different clock frequencies.

Moreover, contrary to the Examiner's assertions, there is no mention of detecting power shutdown on lines 27-30 of column 4 of BUI. Rather, this portion discloses transitioning from AC power to battery power. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Furthermore, the portion of ARAI cited by the Examiner is directed towards providing a standby mode in which power is supplied for a designated period of time in a non-operating state after the power switch is turned off so that data from main memory may be stored in the HDD.

In other words, BUI is directed towards operating with different clock frequencies with no relation to power shutdown, whereas the portion of ARAI cited by the Examiner is directed towards providing a non-operating state after the power switch is turned off. That is, there is no suggestion in the references or reasoning presented by the Examiner for combining the teachings of

determining if the power switch is turned on, as taught by ARAI, with the teachings relating to operating with battery or AC power, as taught by BUI. Accordingly, as the proposed combination of BUI and ARAI lacks motivation, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Furthermore, Applicants submit that the method includes, inter alia, periodically determining whether power is recovered within a first given time period and setting the microcomputer to a stop operation mode unless the power is recovered within a second given time period, which is longer than the first given time period, as recited in claims 5 and 8.

However, Applicants submit that the rejection of claims 5 and 8 are inappropriate at least since the applied references fail to disclose at least the above mentioned features, as recited in the claimed combinations. As admitted by the Examiner, BUI and ARAI fail to disclose these features. The Examiner thus relies upon KLEIN for supplying these teachings. However, in contrast to the Examiner's assertions, the portion of KLEIN cited by the Examiner (column 6, lines 5-13) does not disclose periodically determining whether power is recovered within the predetermined time period (indicated as TT), but merely discloses having power interrupt signals within the time period TT direct the program to routine PB3. More specifically, in the cited portion, KLEIN does not disclose or suggest providing any such determinations periodically, as evidenced at least a lack of the term, "periodically", in the cited portion. Moreover, in addition to the above-mentioned deficiencies, Applicants submit that BUI, ARAI, and KLEIN, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest, inter alia,

two distinct time periods with the second time period being longer than the first time period, as recited in claims 5 and 8. Accordingly, as the applied references of BUI, ARAI, and KLEIN, fail to disclose each and every claimed feature as recited in the respective combinations, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections together with an indication of the allowability of all pending claims.

In view of the amendments and arguments herein, Applicants submit that claims 1, 5, and 8 are in condition for allowance. With regard to dependent claims 2-4, 6-7, and 9, Applicants submit that they are allowable on their own merit, as well as because they depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 1, 5, or 8, which Applicants have shown to be allowable.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections of the claims, as well as an indication of the allowability of each of the claims in view of the herein-contained remarks.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that the present application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully request an indication to that effect. Applicants have amended the claims to enhance clarity only and argued their allowability. Accordingly, reconsideration of the outstanding Official Action and allowance of the present application and all the recited claims therein are respectfully requested and now believed to be appropriate.

The amendments to the claims made in this amendment have not been made to overcome the prior art, and thus, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

Should the Examiner have any questions or comments regarding this Response, or the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

March 3, 2005
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191

Respectfully submitted,
Llewellyn YANCE et al.



Bruce H. Bernstein
Reg. No. 29,027

William Pieprz
Reg. No. 33,630

